

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/599,350	ZUBACK, JOSEPH EDWARD
	Examiner Denise R. Anderson	Art Unit 1797

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Denise R. Anderson. (3) Peter Landos.
 (2) Krishnan S. Menon. (4) Sandra Congdon.

Date of Interview: 04 March 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Daly et al. (US Patent No. 6,120,688, Sept. 19, 2000).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Denise R. Anderson/
 Examiner, Art Unit 1797

Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The invention is a method such that, after a microfiltration and a reverse osmosis unit operation, the waste water stream is treated and used to backwash the microfiltration unit. Applicant argues that the invention is distinguished from the prior art because Daly teaches a filter that uses the retentate stream from a second reverse osmosis unit to backwash the microfiltration units, instead of using the permeate stream. The examiner maintains that Daly reads on claim 1 in the form of the 10 micron filter 54 in the backwash line shown in the figure and discussed at column 7, lines 6-16.